



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,194	02/01/2001	Eleazar Eskin	12206-002001	7090
26161	7590	03/07/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				NGUYEN, LEE
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2682		

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/775,194	ESKIN, ELEAZAR
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LEE NGUYEN	2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 14-17 and 23-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 14-17 and 23-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/06/2006 has been entered.

Claims 1-13, 18-22 and 26-71 were canceled. Claims 14-17, 23-25 remain in prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jokinen et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0095333) in view of Lehikoinen et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0077060).

Regarding claim 14, Jokinen teaches a method comprising: maintaining in a wireless device a list of real-world services that are available from a user of the device through an application running on the device, see [0038], [0040], and [0047]; and through a wireless communication channel, broadcasting information from the device indicative of the available real-world services, see [0040], [0054]. Jokinen fails to teach that the wireless device is a handheld wireless device. In an analogous art, Lehikoinen teaches a portable transceiver 14 which is used to broadcast services to another wireless devices (see [0030] and [0040]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lehikoinen with Jokinen in order to provide portability to the broadcast services.

Regarding claim 15, Jokinen also teaches that the information is broadcast periodically, see [0048].

Regarding claim 16, Jokinen also teaches that another wireless device that receives the broadcast information accesses one of the available real-world services, see figure 10 and [0055].

Regarding claim 17, the apparatus claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in the method claim 14.

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irvin (U.S. Patent 6,658,264) in view of Jonsson et al. (US 2003/0036350).

Regarding claim 23, Irvin teaches a method comprising: maintaining a list of short-range wireless devices within range of a first short-range wireless device (col. 8, 59-64, double entry phonebook, walkie-talkie access number, see also walkie-talkie or Bluetooth transceiver in col. 9, lines 2-5); transmitting a message from an identified user of the first device to a second identified user of a second wireless device over a communication medium (col. 8, 64-66, place the call), the communication medium being selected based at least in part on whether the second device is included on the list, the selection being transparent to the user of the first device (col. 8, 66 through col. 9, 4, see if the cellular number can be associated with a walkie-talkie access number). Irvin does not teach the inherency in the Bluetooth communication system that when in range or to be known within range the Bluetooth devices invoke a service discovery protocol (SDP) so that the devices can know each other when in range. Jonsson teaches that when in range or to be known within range the Bluetooth devices invoke a service discovery protocol (SDP) so that the devices can have the list of desired neighbor devices (see [0003], [0026]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Jonsson to

the system of Irvin so that only devices belong to a desired class can be selected.

Regarding claim 24, Irvin also teaches that if the second device is included on the list, the message is transmitted to the second device over a short-range radio link, and if the second device is not included on the list, the message is transmitted to the second device using another communication medium (col. 8, 64 through col. 9, 4).

Regarding claim 25, Irvin also teaches that if the second device is not included on the list, the message is transmitted to the second device over either the Internet or by mobile telephony (col. 8, 64 through col. 9, 4).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 14 and 17, Applicant argues that the purported obviousness of the wireless device being handheld is not relevant to the fact that the cited references do not disclose and would not have made obvious either maintaining in (the) device a list of real-world services that are available from an application running on the device" or broadcasting (such) information from the device [itself]."

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that in Lehikoinen, the handheld device 14 has the capability of providing advertisements for local stores/services, providing maps, etc (see [0040]). Similarly, the server 40 of Jokinen also can provide real-world services running on an application. Therefore, the combination of Lehikoinen and Jokinen does teach that the handheld device maintains the list of real-world services that are available from an application running on the device and broadcasting such information from the device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7854. The examiner can normally be reached on FIRST FRIDAY OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DORIS TO can be reached on 571-272-7629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



LEE NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER